DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 242 PS 014 786

AUTHOR Pain, K.
TITLE Articulation Linkages: Children and Parents in Early/Basic Education.
INSTITUTION Alberta Dept. of Education, Edmonton.
PUB DATE Aug 84
NOTE 67p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Articulation (Education); Classroom Environment; *Curriculum Evaluation; Developmental Continuity; Educational Improvement; Educational Objectives; Foreign Countries; *Grade 1; Interviews; *Kindergarten; Naturalistic Observation; *Parent Participation; Primary Education; Program Evaluation; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Alberta

ABSTRACT

Included in this document are two reports of studies using data from the same 15 research sites in Alberta, Canada. The first study, "Critical Variables in ECS-Grade One Articulation," documented factors associated with successful articulation of Early Childhood Services (ECS) and primary school programs. Data were collected through observations in kindergarten and first-grade classrooms and through interviews with principals, teachers, and parents. The 15 research sites were ranked by research team members as to the degree of articulation present. Results indicated that, in schools with a high degree of articulation, teachers and principals emphasized the development of children who were self-reliant and self-motivated to learn. First-grade teachers also used more "ECS-like" methods. In schools with low articulation, the emphasis tended to be on socialization, fitting in with the group, and learning school-appropriate behavior. These same interviews were used to gather data for the second study, "Parental Involvement in Early Childhood Services Programming." Overall, parents reported a high level of involvement and many benefits from involvement, with less involvement in the primary grades than in ECS. The studies concluded with specific recommendations for the Alberta Department of Education for Improving articulation and parental involvement at the early childhood and primary school levels. (Author/CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED251242

Articulation Linkages:

Children and Parents in Early/Basic Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Alberta Dept. of Education
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 014786

Planning Services

Alberta
EDUCATION

CRITICAL VARIABLES IN

ECS - GRADE ONE ARTICULATION

A Research Study for

The ECS Branch

Alberta Education

by

K. PAIN, Ph.D.

Completed under Contract to Alberta Education,

August, 1984

Table of Contents

	Page
Summary	i
1. Introduction	1
2. School Selection	2
3. Data Collection	4
4. Analysis	5
5. Differences between High and Low Articulation Schools	6
5.1 Background Factors	8
5.2 Goals	8
5.3 Content and Teaching Styles	12
5.4 Parent Involvement	13
5.5 Other Differences	14
5.6 Articulation Factors	16
5.7 Observation Differences	17
5.8 Differences from the Parents' Perspective	19
6. Comments Concerning the Concept of Articulation	21
7. Conclusions	26
8. Recommendations	31

Summary

This research was conducted to study and document the factors associated with successful articulation of ECS and primary school programs. Articulation as defined for this study has to do with providing continuity of experience for children according to their individual needs from ECS through the primary grades. Data were collected through observations in ECS and Grade 1 classrooms and through interviews with teachers, principals and parents. Interviews and observations were conducted during one-day visits by two members of the study team to 15 different sites in Alberta. In a post-hoc basis, sites were ranked by the observers as to the degree of articulation present, and then grouped into 'High', 'Medium', and 'Low' articulation groups. Data from the 'High' and 'Low' schools was then analyzed to identify differences between the two types of schools.

Results indicated that in High articulation schools goals of teachers and principals tended to emphasize the development of children who were self-confident, self-reliant, responsible, and self-motivated to learn. In L schools, the stress tended to be on socialization, fitting in with the group and learning school-appropriate behaviour. The Grade 1 teachers in H schools were also more likely to

use ECS-like methods in their classrooms. Overall, there was support for the concept of articulation from all three types of school, although the operational definition of 'articulation' used by respondents varied considerably.

CRITICAL VARIABLES IN ECS - GRADE 1 ARTICULATION

1 INTRODUCTION

This research was conducted to study and document the factors associated with successful articulation of ECS and primary school programs. Articulation was defined as: "to form or fit into a systematic whole." Articulation in this sense has to do with providing continuity of experience for children, according to their individual needs, from ECS through the primary grades. In an exploratory study, observation and interview techniques were used to provide a wide-ranging analysis of programs and philosophies.

Data were collected in one-day visits to selected schools. During the visit, at least one ECS and one Grade 1 class were observed, and interviews were conducted with the teachers, principal, parents, and sometimes the ECS coordinator. In this way, information was collected for both this study and the companion research concerning parental involvement.

2 SCHOOL SELECTION

For brevity, the term 'school' will be used here to signify an ECS-Primary School pair, selected for the purposes of this study. In some cases, the ECS and primary

programs were not operated in the same building, nor were they always run by the same board.

Schools were selected for the study on the basis of recommendations from ECS consultants in Alberta Education regional offices. Each consultant was asked to provide one list of schools in which there was a high level of articulation and another list in which there was little articulation. For this selection, 'articulation' was defined for the consultants as joint programming between ECS and Primary Education in which:

1 - Nature of child development is reflected in the programs by the utilization of learning centers and significant parent participation.
2 - Children, teachers, parents and community are active participants in the planning, delivery and evaluation of the program.
3 - Administrative support is provided by at least the principal and also by the superintendent if there is one and perhaps even by the school board or board of directors.
4 - Effective participation by advisory committees is evident.
5 - Articulation activity has been operative for at least two years but preferably longer.

The final selection of schools was then made, attemptimg to approximate proportional representation by: geographical region, urban/rural location, public/separate School District, public/private ECS operators, and public/private primary programs. The five schools in which there was little perceived articulation were chosen from the different regions to represent different perceived reasons for lack of articulation. The final sample of 15 schools had the following characteristics:

(a) Distributed across zones: Zone 1-2 schools; Zone 2-2 schools; Zone 3-3 schools; Zone 4-2 schools; Zone 5-4 schools; Zone 6-2 schools.

(b) Six schools from urban centers with populations of more than 20,000, 5 from small urban centers with populations between 4500 and 15,000 and 4 from rural areas.

(c) Ten of the ECS programs visited were run by public or separate school systems and 5 were run by private operators. Of the five private operators, two were located in private schools (K-12), two were located within public schools, and one was in a community facility.

(d) Of the primary schools visited, 13 were in public or separate school systems (3 in Catholic systems), and 2 were private schools.

(e) All but three of the ECS programs visited were located in the primary school or adjacent to it. Two public and one private ECS programs were located at a distance from the schools attended by Grade 1 children.

3 DATA COLLECTION:

The research team was composed of the Director and the two Associate Directors of the ECS branch, and the research consultant. Two members of this team spent a full day in each of the selected areas. During this time the following types of data were collected using standard observation and interview schedules:

(a) Observations in at least one ECS and one Grade 1 classroom. Where there was more than one class, at either grade level, two were observed when time permitted, or the class representing the highest level of articulation was chosen. These observations lasted between 30 and 60 minutes.

(b) Individual interviews with the ECS and Grade 1 teachers who were observed, focusing on their goals, teaching methods and philosophy and articulation issues.

(c) Interviews with the principal, again dealing with goals, methods, philosophy and articulation issues.

(d) Interviews with parents. These interviews focused

primarily on parental participation for the other study. However, parents were also asked for their opinion on articulation of ECS and primary programs.

(e) Interviews with other stake-holders depending on the regional organization. These others included coordinators, other primary teachers and, in one school, a small group of interested parents.

4 ANALYSIS

Because of the type of data collected, and the exploratory nature of the study, analysis consisted primarily of looking for themes and ideas in interview responses. Since the schools designated as being high in articulation by the area consultants were not always seen as highly articulated by the observation teams, the 4 observers were requested (on a post-hoc basis) to rank schools from high to low on overall articulation. The data of high articulation schools was then compared to those considered low on this variable to see if there were any consistent differences between the two sets of schools.

Reliability of the observations was judged from the records of the two members of the observations team. The observations were generally in agreement, differing on

specifics noted in the observation records rather than on general impressions. All four of the team members visited one of the schools, and four-way reliability was computed for this school. Each of the interviewers completed interview schedules at this school as well, permitting reliabilities of interview records to be determined. Because of the extreme openness of the observation schedules, comments were considered to be disagreements only when they were in contradiction to one another. Comments which were similar in tone and meaning, but different in specifics were considered to be agreements and were then both coded into the results to represent a broader view of the situations seen. On this basis, the reliability (based on the 4 high and 4 low articulation schools) was 210 agreements on 224 categories coded or 94%. The agreement level for the interview records was:

- Grade 1 teacher interview (4-way agreement) - 45/54 = 83%
- ECS teacher interview (2-way agreement) - 52/54 = 96%
- Principal interview (2-way agreement) - 43/48 = 90%

5 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HIGH AND LOW ARTICULATION SCHOOLS

Based on the ranks assigned by the observing team, schools were divided into high, medium and low articulation

schools. 'High' schools were those ranked one or two by at least one of the raters, where the sum of the ranks was less than 6. Similarily, 'low' schools were those receiving 7 or 8 from at least one rater, with a sum of ranks greater than 12. (Ranks were forced into a 1 to 8 scale, to account for differences in the numbers of schools visited by different team members.) Four schools fell into each of the 'high' and 'low' categories (to be termed H and L schools, for brevity in this report).

Rankings of the schools by the two observers (4 observers in 1 school) were very similar, particularly considering that each observer ranked a different subset of schools. Ten (67%) of the schools received the same or adjacent ranks; four (27%) were 2 ranks apart and only one school had rankings more than two points apart.

Because of the small number of schools, principals, and teachers involved, the results of this study must be treated as suggestive rather than conclusive. The numbers are too small to permit statistical tests, and small differences may be a matter of chance, rather than related to the subject studied. As well, a difference found in the background data may either have contributed to the degree of articulation seen in the school, or may have resulted from the articulation: one can only hypothesize concerning the

direction of cause and effect. For brevity, when there were no consistent differences between H and L schools in the responses to a question, it will not usually be mentioned in the report. Most of the differences mentioned involved a ratio of at least 2 to 1 to be considered important enough to discuss, and must have been mentioned by more than two of the respondents.

5.1 BACKGROUND FACTORS:

The principal of a high articulation school is more likely to have taught in ECS, grade 1 or two, and to have taken a psychology course focussing on the early years. He or she is also likely to have spent fewer than 5 years at the school. There was also a sense that the principals in high articulation schools were more 'democratic' in their manner of administration. There were no consistent differences in teacher preparation or experience between high (H) and low (L) articulation schools.

5.2 GOALS

One of the most interesting and consistent differences between H and L schools emerged from the goal statements of teachers and principals. Each of these respondents was asked for his or her three primary goals for children and

also perceptions of other teachers' goals. Through content analysis, these goals were then classified into five general categories:

(a) An emphasis on the individual child and his or her development, including a mention of self-concept, or other type of emotional factor, developing independence, self-discipline or self-responsiblity, having children who are motivated to learn, and who have a sense of curiosity, and finally, having each child develop to his or her own potential at his/her own rate.

(b) An emphasis on social development and socialization, in that children get along with their peers and adults and become less shy. Included in this category were also the more abstract goals of becoming good citizens, and developing tolerance and understanding for others.

(c) Academic goals, including reading, writing, knowing ABCs and numbers, and also language goals. Goal statements that indicated that the desire was for children to learn to read at their own rate, or to their own potential were coded in both categories a and b.

(d) An emphasis on learning through the use of concrete, experiential, manipulative methods, including field trips.

(e) An emphasis on school-specific adjustment, such as

enjoying school (vs. enjoying learning, coded as (a)), being familiar with school routines, learning to follow directions, etc.

These five categories were used to code all of the goal statements from principals, teachers and parents. (They are not in any particular order; all were mentioned often by all types of respondents.) Only a few of the goals did not fit into one of these categories, and these were not given frequently enough to look at differences between the H and L schools.

The most consistent difference in goals between high and low articulation schools involved categories a and b. Principals, ECS teachers, and, to some extent, Grade 1 teachers in high articulation schools focused on the individual child, with goals relating to each child achieving his or her potential, having a good self-concept, and being self-disciplined and independent. In low articulation schools, in contrast, the emphasis was on social adjustment, with the children fitting into groups of peers, adults or society.

In addition to these differences in social and individual goals, both the ECS and the Grade 1 teachers in L schools were more likely to put major emphasis on academic

skills, than those in H articulation schools. This was particularly true of ECS teachers, who did not cite academic preparation (numbers, ABC's, etc.) very frequently.

When asked about each others' goals, the principals and teachers gave similar responses to those cited above. In H schools, respondents saw their colleagues as emphasizing the development of the individual; in L schools, socialization was paramount. Two teachers in low articulation schools indicated that they did not know the other teacher well enough to make any statement concerning her goals. Also, two of the L school ECS teachers felt that the Grade 1 teacher's goals were incompatible with theirs. This response was never made in H schools.

Principals and teachers were also asked about their perceptions of parents' goals. Principals in high articulation schools saw parents as being primarily concerned with developing individual potential, followed by development of academic skills. Those in low articulation schools saw parents as interested almost equally in individual, social, and academic development. However, the parents who were interviewed from H and L schools, had similar goals for their children, and did not appear to make the same types of distinctions which principals saw. Indeed, in contrast to the school's perception, parents from

the L schools were somewhat more concerned with individual development, particularly in achieving independence from home.

5.3 CONTENT AND TEACHING STYLES:

In terms of content and teaching styles, the Grade 1 teachers from the H schools reported that children spent more time in self-selected activities than did those from L schools. In ECS, all H teachers reported spending about 31-40% of their time in self-selected activities. There was a wider range reported by L teachers (from 11-20% to over 50%). Everyone in the study saw play as an important learning tool, but in the L schools, examples were most often structured learning games, whereas the H school examples more often involved some type of exploration and discovery.

When it came to coping with exceptional children, there were a wide variety of methods cited in both types of schools. H schools were more likely to use peers and parents to help with these children, and were also more likely to provide children with the option of sometimes working at another grade level than were L schools.

5.4 PARENT INVOLVEMENT:

There were also differences between H and L schools in terms of parent involvement. Both types of schools felt that parents were fairly involved, but the type of involvement differed. In L schools, types of involvement mentioned by principals and Grade 1 teachers tended to be with extra-curricular aspects of school or at home. In H schools, involvement was more likely to be in-class with the children. There was less difference in the type of involvement in the ECS classrooms, although more of the parents were reported to be involved in the H schools.

The difference in parent involvement was particularly evident in the reactions of Grade 1 teachers toward parent participation. In H articulation schools there were more parents involved, and they were at the school more often. Teachers in these schools either wanted more parent involvement, or felt that parents were satisfied with the current level and could not be more involved than they were. In L articulation schools, Grade 1 teachers expressed more doubts about the effectiveness of having parents in the classroom, wanting them to be better prepared, or concerned with the type of influence exerted.

Most principals (88%) indicated that there was some sort of a parent committee at the school. There was a

tendency for principals in H schools to see this committee more as an advisory and supportive body for the school. In L schools, there were fewer activities cited overall, with some emphasis on political power and influence. Half of the Grade 1 teachers also reported that they had a parent advisory committee. In low articulation schools, this committee seemed to be advisory to the whole school, whereas in H schools it had a more class-focused influence, similar to the ECS Local Advisory Committees (LAC).

All ECS classes had an LAC, with a wide variety of activities cited. The differences that did occur between H and L schools on responses to this question are most likely a result of the private-operator status of several of the low articulation schools, rather than of articulation per se.

5.5 OTHER DIFFERENCES:

All schools reported using some type of standardized testing in the primary grades, generally as an aid to placement and program level decisions. In H schools, principals also indicated that these tests helped to evaluate programs and give new perspectives on children. Grade 1 teachers in both H and L schools used standardized tests, with those in H schools using fewer and more

diagnostic types of instruments. The exception to this general use of standardized tests was ECS teachers in H schools, who used no standardized tests and few checklists.

Communication among teachers in articulated programs is vital. Only in the H schools was time specifically set aside for this communication at staff meetings, subject area meetings or retreats.

All ECS teachers and a few principals in H and L schools had attended in-services related to ECS methods in the last year. The difference between H and L schools in this area was in Grade 1 teachers' attendance: All four teachers in H schools had attended this type of in-service, while only one Grade 1 teacher in L schools had.

One of the advantages of articulation cited most frequently involves an easier transition from ECS to Grade 1. All of the teachers and principals interviewed in H schools felt that children did not experience difficulty in this move unless there was an abrupt change in teacher expectations. In L schools, 9 of the 14 respondents (64%) felt that children had difficulty coping with demands of Grade 1 such as spending a full day in class, paying attention and sitting still, or that they lacked maturity.

In discussing ways of preventing these problems, principals, ECS, and Grade 1 teachers in H schools focused on the need to have ECS a part of the school from the beginning, so that the children know the primary teachers, other students and routines. Those in L schools were more likely to focus on an orientation of some type in the spring and also on trying to ensure that the ECS students are 'ready' for Grade 1 in a variety of ways.

5.6 ARTICULATION FACTORS:

All of the principals and teachers in H schools felt that their programs were articulated, as did half of those interviewed in schools considered to be low in articulation by the observers. Almost everyone would like to see more articulation take place. Principals in schools considered to be well articulated would like more joint planning, sharing of resources and techniques, and parent involvement, with the interface between grade levels continuing past Grades 1 and 2 to higher grades. Principals in low articulation schools focused on their need to learn more about the ECS program, and on the importance of having more information about children coming into Grade 1 and ensuring that children starting school were 'ready'. ECS and Grade 1 teachers in both types of schools focused on the need for communication and joint planning.

When asked about the advantages of articulated programs for the children, those in H schools stressed individual goals, including improved self-concept, progressing at one's own pace, continuity of development, enrichment, and parent involvement. Those at L schools looked primarily at the ECS - Grade 1 transition, including having children more ready for Grade 1, knowing where children were at the beginning of Grade 1 and easing the transition into formal schooling. Few disadvantages of articulated programs were seen for children by any of the respondents, and there were no consistent H/L differences on this question.

There were few consistent differences between H and L schools in respondents ideas concerning conditions necessary for articulation to take place. Therefore these will be discussed in the following section on articulation ideas and suggestions.

5.7 OBSERVATION DIFFERENCES:

It should be noted here that excellent teaching was observed in both H and L articulation schools: There were exciting things happening in both types of environment. Differences given here are specific to the topic of

articulation.

Proximity of classrooms appeared to be an important factor in that there were no H schools in which the ECS and Grade 1 classes were not close together within a school. As well, no H schools included situations where the ECS program was run by a private operator, but 3 of the 4 L 'schools' involved private ECS operations. The school atmosphere in H schools tended to be described as warm, inviting, open and cordial; adjectives for L schools more often included business-like, orderly, disciplined, and pleasant.

There were few differences in the ECS classrooms observed in the two types of schools. The extent of praise and general organization were similar in both cases. In L schools there was more tendency to have all children working at the same task, with less self-selection of activities. All H ECS centers had extensive and varied materials which were used appropriately.

Child interactions in H classes were free-flowing and easy, with children helping each other on tasks. In two H schools, this interaction extended to a primary classroom as well. Child-child interactions were more mixed and more likely to be argumentative and/or tangential in L schools.

There were more H - L differences observed in Grade 1 classes. In the H schools, teacher direction tended to be unobtrusive but effective, with the tasks themselves 'goal-oriented'. There was more small group work in these classes, with students working together on projects. Talking with other students was discouraged only when it was off-task or distracting to others. These Grade 1 classes were often arranged into centers with concrete materials available to children, more opportunity for students selection of activities and more time-tabling flexibility. Parents were seen helping or observing in 3 of the 4 H classes.

In the L Grade 1 classes, the organization was usually more traditional, with desks in rows and a few centers around the periphery. Teachers were more directly controlling, and there was a general expectation that children work silently and alone. Child selection/control of activities was limited to free time after work was done. There were no parents seen in L Grade 1 classes.

5.8 DIFFERENCES FROM THE PARENTS' PERSPECTIVE:

In H schools, parents were more likely to report being involved with the children in ECS classrooms. In L schools, involvement more frequently involved special events.

(parties, swimming, etc.). H parents were either satisfied with the amount of involvement they had, or had no more time for more involvement. In the L schools, parents also said that other time-demands limited their involvement, but there were also suggestions that the amount of involvement was limited by the teacher.

Both H and L parents saw the teachers as open to suggestions, rarely rejecting any. Their goals for their children during ECS were also similar, although the L parents may be somewhat more concerned with their children becoming independent and adjusting to the school environment than H parents.

In grades 1 to 4, H parents were much more likely to be involved in the classroom than L parents (93% of parents interviewed in H schools, compared to 57% in L schools). The type of involvement varied as well, with H parents more often involved in regular class activities, and L parents more likely involved out of the classroom or with special activities. Sixty percent of H and 79 percent of L parents would like to be more involved in the school, particularly in working with the children in class. Again, H parents reported lack of time limiting involvement, while L parents more frequently felt teachers would not welcome more in-class participation.

In terms of the move from ECS to Grade 1, L parents cited spring orientations and ECS preparation as facilitating the step up. In H schools, parents were more likely to indicate that the ECS child had been made an integral part of the school since ECS; knowing the environment, the primary teachers and other students before starting Grade 1.

H parents were more likely to see similarities in the way ECS and other grades were taught in terms of teaching philosophy and methods, and attitudes toward children. Differences seen were related to the developmental level of the child, and also to the greater amount of structure and academic emphasis after ECS. In L schools, parents were more likely to see the difference between ECS and Grade 1 as negative. Teaching in Grade 1 was seen to be less individualized, less concrete, and less creative, with little emphasis given to social development.

Almost all (87%) of the parents interviewed would like to see more integration of ECS methods into later grades. The aspects mentioned include using concrete materials, learning centres, parent involvement and being concerned with individual differences. A few parents in both groups (17%) expressed concern about the appropriateness of an

ECS-like approach in a Grade 1 class. (play, social elements, too relaxed).

6 COMMENTS CONCERNING THE CONCEPT OF ARTICULATION:

This section is based on reponses from all schools in the study, since there appear to be no consistent differences in comments relating to the observed level of articulation.

Eighty percent of those interviewed (principals and teachers) felt that programs were articulated at their schools. Fully 92% would like to see more articulation take place. The meaning of 'articulation' used for these judgements seemed to vary, however, depending on individual philosophies.

Many of the respondents reported that their programs were articulated in the sense that they focused on providing continuity of experience for children, incorporating some ECS-type methods into later grades. (One respondent pointed out that these methods do not 'belong' to ECS, they are just used more frequently at this level.) Other respondents felt that communication among staff, involvement of parents and making ECS a part of the school 'family' were the salient aspects at their school.

The demands of the fixed and heavy curriculum were often cited by respondents as being responsible for the limitation of the extent of articulation possible. Many Grade 1 teachers felt that curriculum demands limited the extent to which they could introduce new methods into their classroom.

In a few schools, 'articulation' appeared to have a different connotation than the one intended, with ECS teachers adapting their programs (to varying extents) to be more consistent with Grade one expectations and teaching methods, rather than primary teachers adopting a more ECS-like philosophy. This 'reverse articulation' was generally expressed by the ECS teacher in terms of using more structured methods or more paper-and pencil tasks during the year in order to have children used to these methods when they entered Grade 1.

The things which respondents would like to see in articulated programs included primarily the elements of teacher communication concerning programs, joint planning (sharing resources, techniques, etc.), and the use of ECS methods in primary grades. (The ECS methods most frequently mentioned were the use of learning centers, and the use of concrete/manipulative materials). Other suggestions made

less frequently involved increased understanding of ECS, involvement of parents, making programs more child-centered, and extending articulation beyond grades 1 and 2. Again, there were dimensions of 'reverse articulation' here with suggestions that ECS needed to do a better job of preparing children for Grade 1 programs by becoming more structured and abstract.

The advantages of articulation seen for children were many and diverse. They included:

- Greater continuity of programs, methods and philosophy.
- Children 'readier' for Grade 1, and at ease making the transition. Children would know what was expected of them and the teachers would have a better understanting of children's abilities at the beginning of the year.
- Happier, more confident children who do not experience as much failure or frustration.
- Children have contact with the rest of the school, which eases the move to Grade 1, makes them part of activities, and helps them feel secure at school. It also lets older children function as leaders.
- Provides enrichment, and a chance to develop children's potential.
- Permits parents to be involved in their children's education with positive results for both parent and child.

- Lets children continue to exercise independence, make choices, be responsible for themselves as they start to do in ECS.
- For teachers, it increases communication, and sharing, and relieves classroom isolation.

Few respondents saw any disadvantages for children in articulated programs, providing that they were well run. A few teachers mentioned possible difficulties of children moving out of an open environment to a more structured program. The need for effective monitoring of programs to ensure that they were effective and reaching all of the children was also mentioned by two of the administrators. Two others mentioned the danger of 'reverse articulation' occurring in some situations.

Most of the disadvantages mentioned were for teachers, and involved the additional time and energy needed to communicate with others and run this type of program.

When asked about the conditions necessary for articulation to take place, there was again a wide variety of opinions expressed. Proximity of ECS and Grade 1 classrooms was seen as important, if not critical (and in all H schools they were close together). Articulation might

be possible without proximity, but it would be more difficult. Teachers also mentioned the need for materials to support a learning-center approach such as listening centres, manipulables, games, etc.

The teachers, themselves, were most often seen as the critical component. They need to be committed to the idea, compatible, and share similar philosophies. To have articulation work, staff must be open, flexible and willing to learn. ECS training for primary teachers was seen as advantageous. The support of parents was also frequently mentioned, as was the need for an aide.

Other support services seen as desirable included consultants in specific areas, including counselling, assessment, and subject areas. A need was frequently expressed for inservices in the philosophy and methods of articulation and ECS in general.

Some school leadership was seen as necessary (or critical) by most, although there was occasional indication that principals need not play this role. There was also a necessity for school jurisdiction support or at least tolerance for the idea. With private ECS programs, this leadership was more of an issue, with neither side wanting to be seen as invading the other's territory. Leadership

from the province was seen as important by some, particularly in setting up expectations to motivate schools to do more in this area.

7 CONCLUSIONS

There appear to be a number of results from the study which point to a fundamental difference in philosophy between high and low articulation schools. The emphasis in high articulation schools is on the development of individual children. An attempt is made to develop self-confident children, who achieve at their maximum level without encountering unnecessary frustration because of the structure of the classroom. Other goals associated with H schools involve children becoming self-reliant and responsible, enjoying learning and being self-motivated. To accomplish these ends, teachers permit more self-selection of activities and are less directive. They structure their classes so that children can proceed at their own pace, be it slower or faster than the norm. Parents and peers are used as resources in helping children learn.

High articulation classes tend to have children working in groups, with the major demand to be on-task rather than to be quiet and still. Children were seen working together and helping one another in this

environment. It is ironic that this level of social interaction is seen less frequently in low articulation classes where socialization is given a higher priority in the teachers' goal statements.

In high articulation schools, academic success is seen as important, but there is a tendency to express success in individual terms as 'achieving potential'. These teachers tend to use concrete and manipulative materials in their classrooms.

Principals in high articulation schools tend to be visible and supportive, promoting the ideas and concepts of articulation. They help to support articulation by locating ECS and Grade 1 classes close together in the school and by using school resources to obtain concrete and manipulative materials.

The Grade 1 teacher may be the critical element in achieving articulation. There were more differences between the responses of Grade 1 teachers in H and L schools than there were between the reponses of ECS teachers. In order for the interface to take shape, the major need may well be for the Grade 1 teacher to be flexible and open since the concept requires more change from traditional methods at this level than in ECS. Articulating programs in Grade 1

also requires that the teacher have the flexibility, knowledge and motivation to adapt ECS methods to the demands of the Grade 1 curriculum.

Overall there appears to be support for the general concept of articulation, even if definitions vary. Many respondents stressed the need for in-service to introduce others to the concepts and methods implied. They also stressed that it cannot be imposed, but must be voluntarily adopted at a school level.

One of the issues emerging out of this study involves the exact meaning of 'articulation' in this context. There was considerable diversity of meaning implied in the responses of those interviewed. Also, the variability in the schools designated as 'highly articulated' by ECS consultants, indicates some confusion in meaning. Indeed there were even some differences in the criteria used by the observers in their ranking of programs from high to low in articulation, although the actual ranking was very consistent.

The central elements of the definition of 'articulation' seem to include the following:

(a) An attempt to provide continuity of experience from ECS to Grade 1, including similar methods and philosophy.

(b) Some opportunity for ECS and Grade 1 students to interact.

(c) Involvement of parents in the program, with parent advisory committees beyond ECS.

(d) Communication and joint planning among teachers.

(e) Active participation by principals who are aware of what is happening in ECS and Grade 1.

In their responses, principals and teachers tended to focus on one or a few of these dimensions of articulation, depending on their own current concerns or philosophy. Continuity of experience, involvement of parents and communication were the areas most frequently seen as part of articulation by those in the schools. In two or three schools, 'reverse articulation' was happening to some extent, with ECS - Grade 1 communication resulting in a more structured, abstract and closed program in ECS.

Most respondents felt that programs were articulated in their schools. This occurred even in schools considered very un-articulated by the observers. It appears necessary to use a different term or to clearly define 'articulation' if it is to be promoted by the ECS Branch in a meaningful way.

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

1 - Clearly and operationally define 'articulation' or use a different term. Otherwise schools may falsely assume they know what is wanted and proceed in undesired directions.

2 - Provide inservice and pre-service training concerning the principles and methods of articulation, particularly for Grade 1 teachers who may be the key elements in adoption of these methods.

3 - Provide inservice or information packages for principals on the concepts and methods of articulation.

4 - Support articulation on a project basis; do not try to impose it. However, a clear expectation from Alberta Education that schools start to move in this direction may be motivating for some schools.

5 - Explore the issue of private operators in the context of articulation. Extra help or different methods may be needed to promote articulation when the ECS program is unaffiliated with the primary school.

6 - Investigate the possibility of altering at least the Grade 1 curriculum to make articulation more feasible, easing the burden on teachers wanting to increase the articulation of programs.

7 - Further study is needed on the outcomes of articulated programs, and on the effects of parent involvement in ECS and primary school programs.

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN EARLY CHILDHOOD SERVICES PROGRAMMING

A Research Study for
The ECS Branch
Alberta Education

by

K. PAIN, Ph.D.

Completed under Contract to Alberta Education,
August, 1984

Table of Contents

	Page
Summary	i
1. Introduction	1
2. Data Collection	1
3. Results	3
3.1 Parental Involvement with ECS and Primary Programs	3
3.2 Individual Growth through Parent Involvement	6
3.3 Reactions of Teachers to Parent Involvment	9
4. Conclusions	11
5. Recommendations	13

Appendices:

A. Parent Interview Summary

B. Information from ECS Teacher Interviews

C. Information from Grade 1 Teacher Interviews

Summary

The purpose of this study was to identify and describe the role of parents in the delivery of ECS programs. Parents, ECS teachers and teachers in Grade 1 in 15 different sites in Alberta were interviewed for this research and a companion project (Critical Variables in ECS - Grade One Articulation). Overall, parents reported a high level of involvement in ECS, with somewhat less involvement in the primary grades. They enjoyed their opportunity to participate in classroom activities and expressed a desire to have this type of involvement extended in the primary grades. Almost all of the parents interviewed reported that their involvement with the ecs program had contributed to their own personal growth. They saw themselves as knowing more about children, and being able to deal with them more effectively. Parents also felt that they had become more aware of what was happening at school, gaining respect for teachers, and becoming more positive toward education in general. They also felt that they had gained confidence in themselves, becoming more outgoing and less shy. Their involvement on the LAC developed organizational and leadership skills.

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN ECS PROGRAMMING

1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to identify and describe the role of parents in the delivery of Early Childhood Services (ECS) programs. Involvement of parents has been a basic principle of ECS since the inception of the program. Local Advisory Committees (LACs) are expected to be formed for the operation of programs, and parent participation in program activities is encouraged. The intent of this study was to document the extent of parent involvement, the parents' perceptions of their role in ECS, their feelings of personal growth during this period of involvement, and their attitudes toward parent involvement in education in general.

2 DATA COLLECTION

For economy in data collection, this study was done in conjunction with the research concerning critical variables in ECS-Primary articulation. Interviews with parents were conducted during one-day visits to 15 different pairs of ECS programs and primary schools selected from throughout the province. (For brevity, these pairs will be called 'schools' in this report, even though they were not always in the same building, nor always administered by the same

board.) These areas included rural and urban communities, public and private ECS programs, and all 6 different educational regions of Alberta. (For a detailed description of these schools, see the study of Critical Variables in ECS - Grade 1 Articulation.) The interviews were conducted by the Director of the ECS Branch, the two Associate Directors, and the Research Consultant.

Fifty-seven parents were interviewed for the study, of which 52 (91%) were mothers. Schools participating in the study were asked to arrange for three or four parents to come in for interviews, choosing parents who had children in both ECS and primary, or who had a child in Grade 1 who previously had been in the ECS program. Twenty-two (39%) of those interviewed had children in both ECS and primary, thirty-one (54%) had children in primary grades (mostly Grade 1). When parents had more than one child in primary programs, the youngest was targetted for the study. (See the data summaries in Appendices A, B, and C for specific numbers and percentages.)

These parents cannot be considered a random sample: both ECS programs and primary schools were free to choose any parents with children in the appropriate grades. Therefore, it must be assumed that this is a special group, very involved with the school or the ECS program, or at

least perceived by the school as being open to this type of interview. Over half of the parents interviewed had held or were holding some position on the ECS Local Advisory Committee (LAC). Therefore, the responses summarized here most likely represent the upper segment of parental involvement and interest, and not the norm. Also, because the interviews were conducted during the day-time, few working parents were included, and there is an under-representation of their views.

3 RESULTS

3.1 PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT WITH ECS AND PRIMARY PROGRAMS:

The most commonly mentioned types of involvement in the ECS program involved helping in the classroom, with the children, at centers, etc. (65% of parents), and going on field trips (63%). Other types of involvement included helping with special activities such as parties or swimming (33%), preparing snacks and lunches (26%), and preparing materials (9%). Three parents (5%) simply observed in the classroom. Eight (14%) of the parents also indicated that they sometimes took responsibility for teaching some portion of the class, such as a craft program or reading to children to free the teacher for other activities. A number of the parents interviewed were certificated teachers and they more

frequently reported contributing in this manner.

Overall, parents seemed satisfied with the extent of their involvement in ECS. The numbers of 'yes' and 'no' responses to this question are somewhat misleading, since many of those who answered both 'yes' and 'no' indicated that personal commitments limited the amount of time they had to contribute. Fully 75% of the parents commented somehow on their lack of time for more participation. Those that did want more involvement generally wanted to be in the classroom, working with the children.

Fewer parents reported being involved in primary programs, although 71% were involved in some way (vs. 100% in ECS). Of those parents who were involved, 53% reported having been involved in the classroom and 11% preparing materials. Field trips, special activities and snacks tend to be less frequent events in the primary grades, and fewer parents reported being involved in these activities after ECS.

Almost 70% of the parents reported wanting to be more involved in primary programs (as contrasted to 37% wanting more involvement in ECS). Many of these parents said that involvement was limited by the fact that they, themselves, had no more time. Over half, however, indicated that they

felt that the teacher at this level would not welcome parent help or that involvement was limited to those who could make a large time-commitment. Parents who wanted more involvement tended to want to work in the classroom, with the children (64%).

Virtually all parents felt that both ECS and primary teachers were open to suggestions from parents. Only 2 (4%) indicated that a teacher was not open to suggestions. The nature of the suggestions differed between ECS and the later grades. In grades 1 to 4, examples tended to center around a single child's problems, attempting to find solutions to things like reading or social difficulties (58% of examples). In ECS, the most common suggestions also included those for the individual child (19%) but also field trips ideas (20%), special activities (19%), and changes in the class schedule or learning centres (15%).

Few teachers rejected suggestions made, but this occurred somewhat more frequently in ECS than in the other grades (10 in ECS; 3 in primary). This may be a result of the number and type of suggestions made since parents are more likely to make suggestions to ECS teachers than to teachers in primary grades. Of the suggestions rejected by ECS teachers, half were seen as being rejected for good reason (such as repeated field trips, unworkable ideas).

Only one of the four suggestions made to primary teachers was seen to have been rejected for good cause.

3.2 INDIVIDUAL GROWTH THROUGH PARENT INVOLVEMENT:

Overwhelmingly, parents felt that involvement in school programs had helped them to grow as individuals (93%). Even some of the 7% who said that they had not grown went on to describe changes in themselves. The kinds of growth noted by these parents tended to center around their relations with children (their own and others'), their feelings about themselves, and their relationship with the school. Changes in knowledge, behaviour and attitude were noted in each of these areas.

The comments made most frequently dealt with the parents' knowledge of and behaviour with children. Twenty-two of the parents (39%) reported that they treated their own children differently after being involved in the ECS program. These changes included different approaches to discipline, understanding their children better and feeling closer to them. Another 17 comments (30% of parents) had to do with the advantages of seeing one's child in a different setting. Eighteen parents (32%) also said that they had learned more about child development and behaviour, as well as about the way children learn. Another twenty (35%)

indicated that they had begun to treat children differently, using approaches more appropriate to the child's developmental level.

Parents also reported changes vis à vis the school, itself. Seventeen parents (30%) indicated that they now knew more about what happens in school and how the system works. Eleven (19%) also said that they felt more positive about school, more comfortable being there, and more positive about education in general. Eight mothers (14%) intended to go on to take further training in some aspect of working with children. Another six (11%) said that the experience had given them more respect for what teachers do, and the amount of ability and preparation necessary. Eight parents (14%) were aware of using the teacher's behaviour as a model for themselves.

The other type of comment made most frequently by parents involved knowledge of, and attitudes toward themselves. Almost half (24 parents) said that the experience had made them more confident, outgoing and organized, and less shy or reticent around others. Parents also felt that experience on the LAC had developed their leadership and organizational skills (9 parents, 16%). Twelve parents (21%) felt that the involvement in the schools had given them more friends in the community, with

the chance to share ideas and express concerns. Six parents (11%) felt that they had had a chance to learn parenting skills from speakers and books. Seven had also picked up specific information such as speech therapy techniques, the extent of child abuse, and general information from field trips.

For almost all of the parents, these aspects of personal growth were unanticipated coming as a 'pleasant surprise'. A few parents (18%) did come into the ECS program with specific goals for themselves, primarily learning more about dealing with children. A number of parents reported that the experience had led to a desire to work more with children, and they were planning to take some courses, themselves, towards this end. One father intended to get on to the school board to promote the idea of more parent involvement in the schools.

Spontaneous comments from parents were almost always positive toward the whole idea of parent involvemnt. Parents had enjoyed their ECS and early primary experiences, and wanted to continue to be involved. Twelve parents (21%) wanted to explore ways of getting more parents involved, particularly fathers.

A few comments (From 4 parents -7%) had to do with the

difficulties working parents face in this type of program, particularly if their children feel left out when parents can not participate in daytime class events. Also, non-working mothers feel that the the number of working parents puts more pressure on those who do not work to help in classroom events.

3.3 REACTIONS OF TEACHERS TO PARENT INVOLVEMENT:

The data for this part of the report is taken from interviews conducted with ECS and Primary teachers for the companion study on Factors in Articulation.

All of the ECS teachers and 82% of the Grade 1 teachers reported that parents were involved in their programs. In ECS, some parents were in the classroom at least 2-3 days per week; in Grade 1, the involvement was more variable, ranging from every day to a few hours a month. The number of parents involved in Grade 1 was also more variable, but tended to be lower than in ECS where at least a third of the parents were reported as being involved in every ECS classroom visited.

The most common parent activities reported by teachers included helping with the children in class, preparing materials, going on field trips, coming for special

activities or bringing snacks. Approximately 60% of teachers at both levels would like even more parent involvement. Grade 1 teachers, however, were more likely to express concerns about negative effects of having untrained parents in the classroom.

All of the ECS teachers and 40% of the Grade 1 teachers indicated that they had a parent advisory committee of some type. The ECS teachers reported that the the LACs made program and field trip suggestions as well as making decisions about budgets, administration and other matters. (The extent of these decisions depended on whether the ECS was privately operated or not). Fewer Parent Advisory Committee activities were reported by Grade 1 teachers, and it was not always clear whether these were classroom or school based groups. The activities which Grade 1 teachers noted centered on programme, field trips and special event suggestions, and also on activities directed toward the school as a whole. Teachers saw these parent committees as helpful in increasing communication, giving them a new perspective, and reducing the teacher's load (particularly in ECS). Few areas of conflict were seen, although there had been some in the past concerning budget/salary and areas of influence.

4 CONCLUSIONS

Overall, this sample of parents reported a high level of involvement in both the ECS program and in the primary grades, although the extent of involvement and the number of different types of activity were greater in ECS. Parents appeared generally satisfied with the level of involvement, stating that personal commitments limited the time available for this type of activity. In the primary grades, however, there were more parents who reported that their involvement was limited by the fact that teachers would not welcome parents in the classroom. Non-involvement of parents in primary programs was so established in some areas that parents had never even considered the possibility of involvement in primary classrooms.

Virtually all teachers were seen as being open to suggestions from parents, rarely rejecting any. Those suggestions that were rejected were often seen by parents to have bee rejected for good cause.

Almost all of the parents interviewed regarded their involvement in the ECS program as contributing to their own personal growth. They saw themselves as knowing more about children, and being able to deal with them more effectively. Much of this change may be due to a modelling of the teachers' behaviour and use of similar methods at home.

This effect was stated explicitly by eight parents and was likely felt by more.

Parents also felt that they had become more aware of what happened at school, gaining respect for teachers, and becoming more positive toward education in general. They also felt that they had gained confidence in themselves, becoming more outgoing and less shy. The involvement on the LAC promoted organizational and leadership skills.

Parents seemed to have enjoyed their opportunity to help in the classroom and to gain understanding of what happened there. Those that would like to be more involved generally want to be in the classroom, and many parents expressed a wish to have this involvement continue into later grades.

Overall, parents were very positive toward the whole idea of parent involvement, seeing positive results for themselves and for their children. Teachers who had parents come in to their classes also saw advantages for themselves in terms of increased support and more effective work with the students.

5 RECOMMENDATIONS

1 - Continue to support parent involvement in the ECS program.

2 - Promote the idea of parent involvement in primary grades.

3 - Provide ideas to teachers for more effective involvement of parents, many of whom clearly want to participate. Ideas to promote involvement coming from this study include:

- Provision of a work-list to let parents choose the type of involvement with which they feel most comfortable (also for working parents).
- Provide parents with the opportunity to observe and model teachers' behaviour with children.
- Conduct a volunteer inservice/orientation to give parents information concerning the most appropriate and useful ways of interacting with children.
- Organize a baby-sitting exchange to free parents with younger children to help in the classroom.
- Use of a parent roster to organize parent involvement.

4 - Explore ideas for the involvement of working parents so that their children do not feel left out, and so that working parents can experience some of the rewards of involvement. Again, ideas from this study include:

- Having a parent resource area in the classroom with books dealing with different aspects of parenting and education.
- Having an area in the classroom with ideas, suggestions and possibly materials for things to make at home.
- Having grandparents or other family members come into the classroom in lieu of working parents.
- Having work bees and parent-child evenings outside of working hours.
- Inviting parents to come in for coffee on a spontaneous, drop-in basis.
- Going to parents' work-sites for field trips.

APPENDIX A

PARENT INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Total	%	Sub-Total	
57	100%		Number of Parents
5	9%		Number of Fathers
Grades of Children			
22	39%	8	- ECS and 1
		7	- ECS and 2
		5	- ECS and 3
		2	- ECS and 4
4	7%	4	- ECS
31	54%	22	- 1 (youngest child)
		7	- 2
		2	- 3
Total	%		
1. Involvement with the Kindergarten program.			
57	100%		No. of parents involved
			Activities:
37	65%		Work in classroom, with children
8	14%		Independent teaching
12	21%		Lunch, snack
5	9%		Prepare materials
36	63%		Field trips
19	33%		Special activities
8	14%		Organizational, meetings
3	5%		Observed

Total	%	
		LAC Involvement:
24	44%	no formal position
20	36%	On LAC executive
11	20%	On LAC (no formal position)
2. Would you like to have been more involved?		
21	37%	YES
36	63%	NO
-In what ways would you like to have been involved?		
4	19%	on board executive
9	43%	work directly with children
4	19%	other
-Why were you not more involved?		
43	75%	not enough time
6	11%	limited opportunity for involvement, parent reluctant
3	5%	teacher reluctant to involve parents
3. Was the Kindergarten teacher open to suggestions from parents?		
55	96%	YES
2	4%	NO

Total	%	
(If yes) Give an example of openness to suggestions.		
10	19%	discussed child's problem with teacher, resolved it together
5	9%	suggestions for parent involvement
11	20%	field trip suggestions
6	11%	parent carried out suggested activity
8	11%	program suggestions
10	19%	other
8	15%	can't think of example
(54	100%	total no. of suggestions)
4. Did the Kindergarten teacher ever reject a suggestion made?		
10	19%	YES
47	82%	NO
(If yes) Describe the situation(s).		
6 7		Parent still seems to disagree with teacher's rational for disagreeing. Parent believes rejection was made with good reason.
(For those with older children. - 53 of the Parents interviewed)		
6. Were you involved in the Grade _____ program?		
37 15	70% 28%	YES NO

Total	%	
How were you involved?		
28	53%	helping in classroom, with children
6	11%	preparing materials
8	15%	field trips
9	17%	help with special activities
1	2%	supervise lunch
6	11%	on PAC, attended meetings
6	11%	other
7. Would you like to have been more involved?		
36	69%	YES
16	31%	NO
In what way would you like to have been involved?		
4	11%	like to know more about what child was doing
23	64%	like to work in classroom, with children
4	11%	field trips
4	11%	other
(36	100%	total)
Why were you not more involved?		
14	27%	teacher did not welcome participation
6	12%	teacher constraints on involvement
31	60%	no more time, didn't want more involvement

Total	%	
8. Was the Gd. _____ teacher open to suggestions from parents?		
51	98%	YES/ didn't make any, but likely yes
1	2%	NO
(If yes) Give an example of openness to suggestions.		
19	58%	suggestions specific to own child
2	6%	suggestions vis-a-vis parent
1	3%	field trips
2	6%	program suggestions
3	9%	suggested alternate materials
6	18%	can't think of example
4	12%	suggestions re parent involvement,
2	6%	other
(31	100%	total number of suggestions)
9. Did the Grade _____ teacher ever reject a suggestion made?		
3	6%	YES
49	94%	NO / none made
(If yes) Describe the situation(s).		
1		Parent still seems to disagree with teacher's rational for disagreeing.
3		Parent believes rejection was made with good reason.

Total	%	
13. Have you grown as an individual as a result of being involved in the Kindergarten program?		
51	93%	YES
4	7%	NO
How have you changed?		
		Re. Children:
22	39%	treat children differently
17	30%	know own child in other settings
18	32%	learned more about child behavior, learning
20	35%	can use different approaches with children, suited to their level
2	4%	read more to child
		Re. School:
17	30%	more idea about what happens in school
11	19%	comfortable coming to the school, positive about school
6	11%	respect for teaching and the need for prep.
2	4%	need for more involvement in future
8	14%	learned from teacher as model
		Re. Self:
7	12%	specific information
6	11%	learned parenting skills
12	21%	new contact with community
9	16%	acquired leadership, committee skills
24	42%	more outgoing, confident, patient,
10	18%	want to work more with kids, learn more
3	5%	other

Total	%	
14. Did you have any expectations for your own personal development from being involved with the Kindergarten program?		
19	34%	YES
37	66%	NO
7		didn't expect anything for self, surprised
10		had specific expectations
15. Other comments/ concerns about parent involvement and the Kindergarten Program.		
11	19%	accolades for school/teachers
12	21%	need to get more parents involved in ECS and primary
5	9%	parent involvement rewarding
4	7%	problems of working parents
5	9%	easy communication helps catch problems early
3	5%	ECS Gd1 change too much of shock- change one of them
2	4%	concerns about child's success in elementary
6	11%	re government controls, articulation, age criteria
2	4%	need to involve community groups
2	4%	other

APPENDIX B

INFORMATION FROM ECS TEACHER INTERVIEWS
(18 TEACHERS)

Total	%	
17. Do Parents ever get involved in your program?		
18	100%	YES
0	0%	NO
- How often?		
6	33%	every day
2	11%	encourage parents to come in AM
2	11%	as often as they wish
3	17%	2-3 days / wk.
- What kind of activities?		
14	78%	helping at centers / with children
10	56%	material preparation
7	39%	crafts
7	39%	snacks
4	22%	field trips
1	6%	library
5	28%	special activities
1	6%	finances, committees
5	28%	depends on parent
2	11%	observe
2	11%	parents may come for coffee-break
1	6%	demonstrate in class, use special skill
1	6%	go to work site for field trips
2	11%	evening fncts, bees for working parents
- Number of parents involved?		
3	17%	31-40%
2	11%	41-50%
3	17%	51-60%
2	11%	61-70%
1	6%	71-80%
6	33%	>80%
- Would you like them to be more involved?		
11	61%	YES
7	39%	NO

Total	%	
- (If yes) In what ways?		
4	22%	already very involved
9	50%	more parents involved in same activities
2	11%	in class help
1	6%	wherever they feel comfortable
2	11%	getting more comfortable with parents
1	6%	sending snacks
2	11%	reluctant to have parents involved
18. Do you have a Parent Committee? (PAC or equivalent)		
16	89%	YES
0	0%	NO
2	11%	NA
- What are its major activities?		
5	28%	program suggestions
3	17%	organize parent help
1	6%	help with program elements
4	22%	snack committee / lunch program
6	33%	field trip suggestions
5	28%	field trip planning
3	17%	plan and organize special events
2	11%	program evaluation
2	11%	administration (private programs)
3	17%	decision-making
4	22%	budgetting
4	22%	planning parent nights
1	6%	fund raising
1	6%	school concerns
1	6%	bussing
1	6%	hires program coordinator (public prog.)
1	6%	advise or make recommendations to admin.
1	6%	newsletter

Total	%	
- In what ways is it helpful?		
4	22%	communication
1	6%	representative on home and school
1	6%	teachers make suggestions, parents try to follow through
2	11%	new set of perspectives
7	39%	support services, frees teacher time
1	6%	frees aide to work with children
1	6%	more one-to-one learning situation
- Are there any areas of conflict?		
12	67%	NO
2	11%	YES - budget/salary debate other years

APPENDIX C

INFORMATION FROM GRADE 1 TEACHER INTERVIEWS
(17 TEACHERS INTERVIEWED)

Total	%	
17. Do Parents ever get involved in your program?		
14	82%	YES
3	18%	NO
- How often?		
3	18%	every day
2	11%	3 days /week
3	18%	1 -2 days /week
2	11%	1-2 days / month
3	18%	other
- What kind of activities?		
7	41%	helping at centers, with children
7	41%	material preparation
3	18%	snacks, lunch
5	28%	field trips
6	35%	special activities(parties, skating)
6	35%	Reading/help with individual children
1	6%	Depends on parent
1	6%	Parent info. corner in class
- Number of parents involved?		
5	29%	11-20%
4	24%	21-30%
1	6%	31-40%
1	6%	41-50%
1	6%	51-60%
1	6%	61-70%
1	6%	>70%

Total	%	
- Would you like them to be more involved?		
10	59%	YES
7	41%	NO
- (If yes) In what ways?		
6	35%	with children, in class
1	6%	planning
1	6%	prepare materials
3	18%	continuity, stnd of parent help is NB
1	6%	lunch program
3	18%	involve more people
2	12%	other
- (If no)		
3	18%	satisfied with involvement
1	6%	prefer aide
6	35%	concerned about negative influences, effects of involvement
1	6%	parents couldn't be more involved
18. Do you have a Parent Committee? (LAC or equivalent)		
7	41%	YES
10	59%	NO
- What are its major activities?		
2	12%	program suggestions, planning
1	6%	snack committee, lunch
3	18%	field trip suggestions, planning
2	12%	help with special events
1	6%	scheduling volunteers
2	12%	newsletter, handbook
3	18%	fund raising
5	29%	advisory to whole school

Total	%	
- In what ways is it helpful?		
3	18%	reduced load for teachers, exciting
1	6%	follow-up with children at home
1	6%	got renovations made to school
1	6%	communication, having parents in school
1	6%	wouldn't want one in Gd 1: not necessary
- Are there any areas of conflict?		
5	29%	no
2	12%	yes
1	6%	budget/salary debate other years
2	12%	role / power conflicts